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This study investigates the relationship between peer group facilitation and the changes in self-concept, interpersonal relations and school interest of secondary students in an alternative school. To carry out the study, a peer group facilitation program was incorporated into the curriculum of an alternative high school.

The seventy subjects in this investigation attended an alternative school located in a suburban county of North Texas. The students enrolled in this school were re-enrolling drop-outs from the public school system. Seventy-six per cent had dropped out once, twenty-two per cent had dropped out twice, and two per cent had dropped out more than twice. The student population was ninety-nine per cent white and from predominantly middle and upper-middle class socioeconomic families.

The average daily enrollment of the alternative school at the time of the study was 101 students. The students ranged in age from fifteen to twenty years and were distributed as follows: seven per cent were fifteen years old, twenty-eight per cent were sixteen years old, thirty-four per cent were seventeen years old, twenty-three per
cent were eighteen years old, six per cent were nineteen years old and two per cent were twenty years old.

A screening committee composed of students and faculty screened and selected twelve peer group facilitators from the total student population. The selected students were trained in communication and coping skills and in group dynamics during a total of sixteen sessions over an eight week period. After training, these twelve peer group facilitators co-led six groups of students for a total of fourteen sessions over a seven week period.

To measure changes in students' self-concept, interpersonal relations and school interest, the following instruments were used: *Tennessee Self-Concept Scale* (TSCS), *Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others--Behavior* (FIRO-B), *Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others--Feelings* (FIRO-F), and the *School Interest Inventory* (SII). Pretest measures were administered to peer group facilitators before training and to control group members and peer group members before group participation. Posttest measures were administered to all groups at the conclusion of the study.

The findings indicated that participants in the program showed a significant gain in school interest over non-participants. Self-concept scores of participants did not differ significantly from those of non-participants.
Differences between participants and non-participants on the FIRO-B were not statistically significant. Statistically significant differences between the two groups were found on the Expressed Control and Wanted Affection subscales. In addition, the study investigated if, at the end of the program, there were any significant differences between the twelve selected peer group facilitators and the peer group members. Self-concept, interpersonal relations and school interest measurements indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between these two groups.

The findings support a positive relationship between participation in a peer group facilitation program and positive attitudes toward school. The research does not support the belief that peer group facilitation groups foster positive changes in self-concept and interpersonal relations. However, the findings of this study lend support to continued exploration of peer group facilitation to increase the school interest of secondary students in the alternative school.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Adolescents need peer and adult acceptance as they grow toward emotional maturity (27). However, as adolescents begin to seek personal autonomy outside the family, they increasingly turn to the peer group in the search for an individual identity (8, 20) because of shared values, interests, language systems, and other developmental characteristics (5). Within the peer group, adolescents are able to learn social and adjustment skills (3), try out different adult roles (24), explore new identities (17), and release resentment toward authority figures (21).

Participation in a peer group usually requires adolescents to conform to group values. Full acceptance by a group may lead an adolescent to adopt group values that are in conflict with generally accepted social norms. The adolescent who is faced with a conflict between personal and group values ultimately risks rejection by the group. Either acceptance of anti-social values or rejection by the peer group may have a serious negative effect on an adolescent. Often those who are rejected by the group, or are members of a group that does not conform to expected social behavior, have a record of chronic school absenteeism, academic failure (16, 30, 31, 33) and low self-concept (29).
These students also tend toward juvenile delinquency, drug abuse (12, 13, 14, 15), and ultimately to becoming school drop-outs.

The development of the alternative school is one attempt by school personnel to provide an opportunity for students who have dropped out to re-enter the public school system. Alternative schools provide an opportunity for students to attend and graduate from high school while they earn an income and gain experience working in the community. Alternative schools may differ somewhat in curriculum, but they all tend to have small populations and flexible schedules which permit part-time employment. The alternative schools provide remedial instruction for areas of academic deficiency (1, 22, 26, 32, 18), development of vocational skills, and support for seeking and maintaining employment.

Alternative schools have attracted many students who would otherwise be school drop-outs, but the schools generally have not used the power of the peer group to encourage those students to remain in school. The potent force of the peer group can be used in an organized and positive way through peer groups and peer facilitation programs in the schools. Peer group facilitation has been shown to expedite the social and emotional growth of students in traditional school settings (6, 10, 25) and should be beneficial in alternative schools.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to answer the question is there a relationship between peer group facilitation programs and changes in self-concept, interpersonal relations, and school interest of secondary alternative school students.

Purposes of the Study

This study was designed to determine whether or not peer group participation and peer group facilitation were related to changes in self-concept, interpersonal relations, and school interest in adolescents who attend an alternative school program, and to provide information related to peer group facilitation programs for school counselors in alternative school programs.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were used.

Alternative school—a designated site and program designed to re-enroll high school students who have dropped out of school and thus to retain students in a public school program. The more individualized and less structured program of the alternative school provide an opportunity for students to gain credits necessary for high school graduation. Students attend school for one-half day and most of
the students are enrolled in an on-the-job training program
the remainder of the day.

Self-concept—a set of statements which incorporates
individual perceptions and evaluations of one's self. These
statements are expressed in attitudes, behaviors, and verbal
responses to others (9). For this study, self-concept was
operationally defined as the Total Positive score an indi-
vidual received on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

Interpersonal relations—the interchanges between an
individual and others, and the degree to which the individual
is the originator or recipient of behavior. For this study,
interpersonal relations were operationally defined as the
six scores an individual received on the Fundamentals of
Interpersonal Relations with Others—Behavior (FIRO-B)
and the six scores an individual received on the Fundamentals
of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Feelings (FIRO-F).

School interest—the attitude a student shows toward
school as an institution and toward school-related situations
(4). Attitude toward school was operationally defined for
this study as the score an individual received on the School
Interest Inventory.

Peer—students of the same or similar age or grade,
attending the same school.

Peer group facilitation—the process of students who
are trained to lead small group discussions, helping
students to communicate more openly about personal, interpersonal, and scholastic concerns (2).

Hypotheses

This study tested the following hypotheses.

1. Students participating in the peer group facilitation program will obtain a significantly higher adjusted mean score than non-participants on the Total Positive Score of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

2. Students participating in the peer group facilitation program will obtain adjusted mean scores significantly different from non-participants on the six subscales of the Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Behavior (FIRO-B).

3. Students participating in the peer group facilitation program will obtain adjusted mean scores significantly different from non-participants on the six subscales of the Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Feelings (FIRO-F).

4. Students participating in the peer group facilitation program will obtain a significantly lower adjusted mean score than non-participants on the School Interest Inventory.

5. Peer group facilitators will obtain a significantly higher adjusted mean score than peer group members on the Total Positive Score of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.
6. Peer group facilitators will obtain adjusted mean scores significantly different from peer group members on the six subscales of the Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Behavior (FIRO-B).

7. Peer group facilitators will obtain adjusted mean scores significantly different from peer group members on the six subscales of the Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Feelings (FIRO-F).

8. Peer group facilitators will obtain a significantly lower adjusted mean score than peer group members on the School Interest Inventory.

Background and Significance of the Study

Peer group facilitation is one approach to using peer group influence to effect positive emotional and social growth in adolescents (5). A unique aspect of peer group facilitation is that groups are led by students called peer group facilitators, rather than by professional counselors. One advantage of using trained students as facilitators is that when several students can be trained to lead groups and those students can effect at least the same degree of positive change as the professionally trained personnel, significant changes may occur for many more students than could be reached by certified guidance personnel alone.

Peer group facilitation has been effective with adolescents in traditional school settings. Parker (25) found no
significant difference in measures of self-concept and behavior between peer-facilitated groups and counselor-led groups of ninth graders. Murphy (23) found no significant differences in locus of control and time competence between peer-facilitated and counselor-led groups of tenth graders. He also found no significant difference in group members ratings of group leader effectiveness. Margro (19) found that junior high school girls who participated in peer-led groups were not significantly different from girls in counselor-led groups in coping with social behavior problems. This research seems to indicate that peer group facilitators may be as effective as professional counselors in dealing with the social and emotional concerns of adolescents in a peer group program.

Peer group facilitation programs have been used to improve the self-concept, interpersonal relations, problem solving skills, and school interest of adolescents in the public schools. Frank, Ferdinand, and Bailey (10) found that six junior high school students who had been trained to lead groups achieved significant behavioral gains according to teacher reports. Likewise, Dyer, Vriend, and Murphy (6) found that eleventh grade peer group facilitators reported positive changes in feelings and behavior after participation in a peer group facilitator program. Hamburg and Varenhorst (11) found that peer group members of peer
facilitated groups in grades seven through twelve reported positive changes in academic, social, and personal concerns.

Although peer group facilitation programs have been reported to have a positive effect on adolescents (6, 10, 11), statistical analyses and results are often missing from reported studies. In addition, a review of the research indicates that peer group facilitation as an intervention procedure in the alternative school has yet to be explored. It would appear that this program could be used to enhance the self-concept, interpersonal relations, and school interest of alternative school students. Therefore, research in peer group facilitation as an intervention procedure in the alternative school is needed to explore this program as a viable resource for helping alternative school students.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study was limited to students enrolled in a public alternative high school. The students were from a middle and upper middle class, white suburban North Central Texas community (23).

Basic Assumptions

This study assumed that the subjects involved were representative of the population of white students enrolled in an alternative high school. Further, it was assumed that subjects responded honestly to the instruments used to
measure self-concept, attitudes, and interests and that these instruments provided valid measures of the characteristics for which they were used. It was assumed that sporadic attendance rates of students enrolled in the alternative school and the students' personal circumstances would not be differential factors.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature relevant to this study is presented in five sections: (a) peer group facilitation as an extension of school guidance services, (b) peer group facilitation and self-concept, (c) peer group facilitation and interpersonal relations, (d) peer group facilitation and school interest, and (e) peer group facilitation and school drop-outs.

Peer Group Facilitation as an Extension of School Guidance Services

School guidance services to students can be increased through peer group facilitation. Fink, Grandjean, Martin, and Bertolini (7) studied the effects of a Peer Tutoring Counseling Service on student's academic and adjustment problems. Junior and senior students selected as "peer tutor-counselors" received two hours of training per week for fourteen weeks. The training format emphasized human relations skills, communications skills, group processes, and tutoring skills. Referrals for tutoring and guidance were made by administrators, counselors, and teachers, although self-referral was possible. According to school records, thirty-three per cent of the total student body had experience in the program directly or indirectly.
To evaluate the program, questionnaires were devised by school personnel and administrators and were answered by the thirty students who received peer counselor help, and thirty faculty members and sixty students chosen at random. Results indicated that "peer tutor-counselors" believed that eighty per cent of the clients had improved in academic performance and that seventy-eight per cent had improved in personal adjustment. The faculty believed that sixty-four per cent of the "peer tutor-counselors" had an improved overall adjustment.

The purpose of a peer group facilitation program developed by Leibowitz and Rhoades (16) was to provide services to a larger number of students and to provide a referral system for the school counseling department. The peer group facilitation program was developed by the school administration. Faculty members were asked to nominate peer group facilitators based on the degree of maturity, emotional status, dependability, and general effectiveness of each student. Twelve high school students were nominated from fifty applicants who had been screened in an interview. These twelve students were trained in listening, responding, and decision-making during weekly sessions of two and one-half hours for nine weeks.

Results of the study indicated peer group facilitators learned to differentiate levels of empathy and understanding as measured by the Carkhuff Counseling Effectiveness Scale.
The study did not explore use of trained peer facilitators as group leaders, or the effect of training on the facilitators and group members.

Dunlap (4) also explored the feasibility of using a peer facilitation program to expand school guidance services. Sixteen eleventh and twelfth grade peer facilitators were trained to participate in orientation of new students by dispensing career information and by tutoring. The peer facilitation training program was divided into three parts over an unspecified time period: vocational information, field visitation, and problem solving through brainstorming in small groups. The peer group facilitators worked in small groups with students at the elementary and junior high school levels.

No formal pre-post testing was done because such measures were deemed by the investigators to be inadequate to measure changes. Instead, questionnaires were used to evaluate the program. Ratings of the program ranged from excellent to fair.

The results of efforts to expand guidance services through the use of peer group facilitators indicate positive changes in personal adjustment and communication skills of students in traditional schools. The peer group programs have been evaluated primarily in terms of questionnaires and opinions, however, and few standardized measures of change are reported.
Peer Group Facilitation and Self-Concept

A direct relationship appears to exist between positive self-concept and school success (19), and between high self-esteem and consistent appropriate social behavior and internal locus of control (2, 3, 10, 22, 24). There are also findings that indicate an adolescent's self-concept and interpersonal skills are greatly influenced by the peer group (13). Only two studies were found, however, which investigated the relationship between membership in peer facilitated groups and the self-concept of adolescents (8, 20).

Frank, Ferdinand, and Bailey (8) investigated the relationship of peer group facilitation to the self-concept and interpersonal relations of the facilitators. Six junior high school students were trained to lead groups over eighteen one hour sessions twice a week. After training, the six peer group facilitators co-led three groups composed of twenty-five freshmen each. Personal Inventories from Title III ESEA Peer Counseling Handbook (14) were used to evaluate the program. Peer group facilitators were found to be more responsible at the end of the program than at the beginning of the program, and self-concept of participants improved according to self report. Also, peer group facilitators appeared to have more significant behavior gains than did group members according to teacher reports. Statistical analyses of data were not reported in this study.
A study of the relationship between peer group facilitation and the self-concept of teenage drug abusers was conducted by Samuels and Samuels (20). Their study assumed that poor self-concept was directly related to the behavior of drug abusers. To measure changes in self-concept, Samuels and Samuels (20) created the self-concept instrument, As I See Myself (AISM).

Peer group facilitators and group members came from twenty-four junior and senior high schools; there were 144 experimental members, matched with 144 control group members, based on attitudinal scores on the AISM. Peer group facilitators were selected by the faculty and were trained one to three times a week for a minimum of two hours per week and a total of eighteen to twenty-four hours. The training program consisted of teaching listening skills, giving feedback, clarifying communications, and teaching procedures for referring students to counseling. Peer facilitators were active in forming rap groups and in running growth groups.

Results indicated a significant positive difference in self-concept between members of the experimental and control groups. No significant difference was found between students from different schools. Moreover, students' self-reports indicated student participants were more aware of others' feelings and believed the program adequate to deal with their needs. Teacher responses on questionnaires indicated substantial positive changes in behavior of the experimental group members.
The findings of these studies indicate there is improvement in the self-concept of participants in a peer group facilitation program. Further research in this area seems indicated due to the limited number of reported studies and the dirth of statistical data.

Peer Group Facilitation and Interpersonal Relations

Peer group facilitation has been used specifically to promote interpersonal relations among adolescents (1, 12, 17). Mosher and Sprinthall's (17) investigation of peer group facilitation was one of the first systematic attempts to train peer group facilitators in communication skills. Seven hundred students were encouraged to participate in a peer group facilitation program offered as a course in the school curriculum. An unspecified number of students from a middle class high school and from a black inner city high school volunteered for this study (17). Members of the experimental group were trained in communication skills once a week for three hours over twelve weeks. Changes in communication skills were measured by the Carkhuff Scales of Empathy, Genuineness, and Immediacy. There was a significant positive improvement in the communication skills of members of the experimental group.

The relationships between peer group facilitation and social problem solving was investigated by Dyer, Vriend, and Murphy (5). A peer group facilitation program was incorporated into the school curriculum as a part of social
studies and religion classes. Six eleventh graders were trained to lead small groups. The training program, based on Albert Ellis' approach (6) to counseling, was divided into two parts: (a) the introduction to the peer group facilitation program and (b) knowledge of peer facilitation conveyed through reading assignments and tests. The training meetings were held twice a week for two quarters. Thirty volunteer participants were divided into three groups of ten and each group was co-led by two of the six trained facilitators. No statistical outcomes were reported, but participants indicated positive changes in behavior and feelings.

To explore the relationship between peer group facilitation and interpersonal skills, Buck (1) developed a peer group facilitation program. Twelve peer group facilitators were chosen for training. Criteria for selection included: (a) attendance at a junior or senior high school, (b) enrollment in a psychology or social science course, (c) identification by a teacher and counselor as having high leadership skills, positive character traits, and a desire to help others, and (d) achievement of high scores on the Buck Interpersonal Relations Rating Scale (l).

Peer facilitator training consisted of two one-hour sessions per week for sixteen weeks. The training program was divided into the following five phases: (a) team building and the development of group cohesion, (b) development
of understanding and awareness of self, (c) development of more effective communication skills, (d) feedback procedures, and (e) development of leadership and problem-solving skills. Peer facilitators were assigned to groups of five to ten participants for a nine-week period. Group participants were teacher-referred on the basis of number of school absences, arguments with teachers, aggressive behavior toward peers, and academic failures. Self-referrals were also accepted.

All group participants were pre-post tested using the Buck Interpersonal Relations Scale and the Coopersmith Self-Concept Scale. Participants reported gains in problem-solving and communications skills, and teachers reported less aggressive behaviors and more effective problem-solving skills among students. While this study defines personal development in terms of improvements in self-concept and interpersonal skills, no statistical data are presented in the published report and the findings appear to be based primarily on self-report.

The relationship between developmental growth experiences of adolescents and peer group facilitation was studied by Kaplan (12). Ten students and two adult counselors met daily for one hour during an entire semester. The purposes of the training sessions were to develop trust, to learn to communicate more effectively, and to become aware of personal and social values. After the training period, peer
facilitators planned and led RAP (Relations and Association with People) groups. Members of the RAP groups were identified through the use of a Personal Problem Checklist. The peer group facilitators were pre-tested at the beginning of the training program and were post-tested after eighteen weeks, using the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Statistical findings were not significant. Responses from peer group members indicated that seventy-nine per cent of the group participants felt more comfortable with themselves, and eighty-eight per cent wanted to continue in the program.

Hamburg and Varenhorst (9) incorporated peer group facilitation as part of a comprehensive mental health program in a secondary school system in an attempt to help students deal with stress. One hundred and sixty-two volunteers from grades seven through twelve, ages twelve to eighteen, from three junior and three senior high schools participated in an introductory meeting. A supervisory committee (three psychologists, one counselor, and one English teacher) chose an unspecified number of peer facilitators to lead groups of eight to ten students. The peer facilitation training program was divided into three parts: understanding people/interpersonal relations, discussion of topics relevant to peer group facilitation, and clarifying the role of peer group facilitator. Details of procedures were not given and standardized instruments were not used to measure changes. However, the 155 students who finished
the program generally reported feeling better about themselves and being able to talk more freely with each other.

Lackey (15) studied peer group facilitation and its relationship to interpersonal competence, communication problems, student perception of rejection, and positive attitudes toward school and teachers. Thirty students were selected for training as peer group facilitators by faculty members who used unreported selection criteria. Peer group facilitators were divided into groups of ten to thirteen and met for training one hour per day for three weeks. Peer group members were divided into groups of thirteen and were co-led by peer group facilitators for an unspecified length of time. Training procedures were not published.

To measure changes in behavior and attitudes, a student questionnaire was employed at the beginning and at the end of the program. All peer group facilitators and members reported significant improvement in assertiveness, feelings toward others, and feelings toward school. However, validity and reliability data for this questionnaire were not published.

Varenhorst (23) used peer group facilitation to train junior and senior high school students to talk more effectively with peers. Six students were chosen by an unspecified evaluation procedure to be peer group facilitators. These facilitators were trained in communications skills,
decision-making and exploring alternatives, and other related strategies, in weekly meetings over a twelve-week period. Instruments used to measure changes and results of the program were not reported.

The literature related to peer group facilitation and interpersonal relations indicates self-reports of positive changes after participation in the program. Lack of use of standardized evaluation instruments and statistical comparisons, however, make evaluation difficult.

Peer Group Facilitation and School Interest

An increase in students' positive feelings toward school after participation in peer group facilitation was reported by Lackey (15) even though school interest was not the major concern of his study. Only one other study of peer group facilitation and school interest was identified. Johnson, Mikel, and Crawford (11) developed a peer group facilitation program in an attempt to reduce violence, vandalism, and racial tension in a high school. The principal formed a Task Force of students, teachers, parents, police, psychologists, and sociologists. The Task Force developed a course, the Peer Leadership Program, to introduce peer group facilitation to the student body. The course goals were: (a) understanding of preventive law in society, (b) developing communication, personal interaction, and group processes, (c) developing appreciation and acceptance of others' values, (d) providing resources and guidance to peers, (e) understanding of leadership qualities and the power of peer leadership, (f)
discussing student problems in class, and (g) improving
student attitude toward school. The course was divided
into four parts: (a) law and areas of personal and social
concern, (b) interpersonal communication, group discussion
and field experience, (c) classroom discussion which focuses
on student problems, and (d) student-implemented disciplin-
ary action. Students, teachers, administrators, and offi-
cers were asked to nominate students for the Peer Leadership
Program course. Fifteen to twenty students, including self-
referred students, enrolled in the course. Details of the
course duration and the procedures used to teach the course
were not published.

Changes in attitude toward school were measured by
Likert's Profile of a School Questionnaire (POS) and by
school records. After completion of the course there was a
twenty-two per cent decrease in physical attacks upon other
students, twenty-five per cent decrease in vandalism costs,
five per cent decrease in absences, nine per cent decrease
in drop-out rate, and a forty-six per cent increase in stu-
dent involvement. The Peer Leadership Program was considered
to have a positive impact on the school population and on
school interest.

Based on this very limited number of studies, peer
group facilitation appears to have a positive relationship
to school interest (11, 15). The lack of data in this area
makes conclusions tenuous.
Peer Group Facilitation and School Drop-Outs

Few studies have examined the effectiveness of peer group facilitation in reducing the number of school drop-outs (18). Schweishimer and Walberg (21) studied the relationship between peer group facilitation and the variables of self-concept, school learning, performance, attitude, and classroom behavior. A total of 101 mainstream, potential high school drop-outs and twenty-one emotionally disturbed, handicapped high school students were identified as potential participants in this study. On the basis of reading achievement, number of retentions, and teacher ratings of behavior, fifty-three of these students were selected for participation in the program. Sixty-nine students were chosen as members of the control group. Sixteen peer group facilitators were selected by sociometric peer nomination based upon degree of empathic responses observed by peers.

The peer facilitator training program was comprised of experiential, didactic, and pragmatic components and was implemented by two trainers from a non-public school environment. Specific procedures for the program were unpublished. Upon completion of training, peer group facilitators led groups for one hour, twice a week, for ten weeks. Results of the pre-post testing using a 5-point Likert scale developed by the investigators and adapted from instruments by Coopersmith, Engel, and Gordon indicated that peer
facilitation had a positive effect on the self-concept of potential school drop-outs.

Summary

It is apparent that peer group facilitation programs have been reported to be successful in traditional high schools in extending guidance programs and in improving self-concept, interpersonal relations, and school interest. There is a dearth of statistical data and use of standardized instruments to measure changes and the extent of the usefulness and influence of these programs is largely based on self-reports. Moreover, specific areas of potential impact have just begun to be explored and there are no studies to date which deal with peer group facilitation in alternative schools.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter includes descriptions of (a) selection of subjects, (b) description of instruments, (c) collection of data, and (d) procedures for analysis of data.

Selection of Subjects

The subjects in this investigation attended an alternative school located in a suburban county (4) in North Texas. The students enrolled in the school were re-enrolling dropouts from the public school system. Seventy-six per cent had dropped out once, twenty-two per cent had dropped out twice, and two per cent had dropped out more than two times. The student population was ninety-nine per cent white from predominantly middle and upper middle class socioeconomic families (7).

The average daily enrollment of the alternative school was 100. The average enrollment at the time of this study, during the third and fourth quarters of the academic year, was 101. The students ranged in age from fifteen to twenty years in the following distribution: seven per cent were fifteen years old, twenty-eight per cent were sixteen years old, thirty-four per cent were seventeen years old, twenty-three per cent were eighteen years old, six per cent were
nineteen years old, and two per cent were twenty years old (?).

The central school administration and the principal of the alternative school agreed to support a peer group facilitation program at the school. The peer group facilitation program was developed and supervised by the investigator and a faculty advisor, who is a group specialist, from North Texas State University.

The initial phase of the peer group facilitation program was to introduce the program to the alternative school faculty. Two faculty workshops were arranged for this purpose. The entire faculty, composed of six teachers, a counselor, and the principal, was included in the invitation to the first faculty workshop. The principal, school counselor, and five teachers attended. During this first luncheon meeting, the faculty was introduced to the idea of peer group facilitation, the rationale for using this process, and the criteria to be used to select potential peer group facilitators (Appendix A). The investigator encouraged questions and comments about the program and asked the faculty to think about possible nominees for the peer group facilitation program based on the criteria discussed (Appendix B).

Following the first faculty workshop, the investigator and faculty advisor developed a questionnaire to be used as a guideline in the selection of peer group facilitators (Appendix E). Characteristics used in the questionnaire were
selected from Samuels and Samuels' Handbook (9): (a) ability to listen, (b) ability to communicate caring, (c) desire to help others, and (d) ability to cope with problems.

Selection of the Peer Group Facilitators

The second workshop, held two days after the first one, was attended by the principal, school counselor, and the same five teachers. The investigator asked the teachers and the school counselor to nominate students to serve as peer facilitators, two of whom would serve as representatives on the Student Faculty Selection Committee.

During the workshop the faculty decided that a positive response on at least two of the five questions by each faculty member would be the minimum criteria for the initial screening of potential facilitators. A list of eighteen students was formed. The faculty then decided a minimum of two faculty votes would be required for any of the eighteen students to be nominated as a peer group facilitator. Fifteen students were nominated.

From the fifteen student nominees, the faculty chose two student representatives for the Student Faculty Selection Committee. Two faculty volunteers were requested to represent the faculty on the Student Faculty Selection Committee and two faculty members volunteered during the meeting. Thus, the Student Faculty Selection Committee was comprised of two faculty members, two student members
selected by the faculty, and the investigator. The function of this committee was to select student and faculty nominees for peer group facilitators (Appendix C).

Within five days of their selection, the two student members of the Student Faculty Selection Committee were introduced to the peer group facilitation program by the investigator. The students were given the opportunity to demonstrate interest in the program either by making posters to advertise the program, or by introducing the program to the students attending the co-op classes. The students chose to make posters advertising the introductory meetings of the peer group facilitation program to be held during the co-op classes. The co-op classes were chosen as target classes because eighty per cent of the school population attended them (7).

The investigator introduced the peer group facilitation program to student co-op classes and encouraged students to inform absentees about the program (Appendix D). The investigator conducted discussion groups composed of three to five students until ninety per cent of the student body had received information about the peer group facilitation program. Students were encouraged to ask questions about the program. The characteristics and responsibilities of peer group facilitators were explored and defined and questions about the duties of the peer group facilitators were explained during the discussion groups. Then during co-op classes, students
were asked to nominate peer group facilitators by writing the names of their choices in the spaces provided on a student questionnaire (Appendix F). A student had to be nominated on at least two separate questionnaires in order to be included on the student list. A total of ten nominees was obtained from the student questionnaires.

There was a total of twenty-five nominees, ten student nominees and fifteen faculty nominees. Of these, three names appeared on both lists. Thus, the Student Faculty Selection Committee made the final selection from a list of twenty-two names. A nominee was required to have three votes: two faculty and one student vote or two student and one faculty vote to be nominated for peer group facilitator. After the screening process, there were fifteen nominees for peer group facilitator; all ten student nominees and five faculty nominees were selected.

The Student Faculty Selection Committee contacted these fifteen nominees and asked them to participate in a five minute interview to be held during school time. Fourteen declared an interest in the program and were interviewed and questioned about their expectations of the peer group facilitation program. One student decided not to participate because of time and academic pressures. After the interviews, the Student Faculty Selection Committee met and decided to present the fourteen nominees with a contract, stating the conditions and expectations for peer group facilitators,
the assignments required and minimum attendance at fourteen of the sixteen sessions (Appendices G and H). Two course credits were offered for completing the training and facilitation of peer groups. Participants were asked to signify their commitment by signing the contract (Appendix J). Two nominees decided not to participate as peer group facilitators because of heavy academic pressures and pending graduation. Those nominees who were under eighteen years of age were asked to gain parental permission to participate in the program (Appendix K). The twelve remaining nominees were asked to meet for pretesting.

Selection of Peer Group Members

The Student Faculty Selection Committee used an alphabetical listing of students from which to select group members. The original twenty-two nominees for peer group facilitator were omitted from the list. Each student's name was numbered and those students with odd numbers beside their names were placed on the peer group membership list.

There were thirty-eight potential peer group members. Members of the Student Faculty Selection Committee contacted these thirty-eight students either in person or by phone to invite them to a lunch hour meeting to discuss the peer group facilitation program. Of the thirty-eight students contacted, thirty-five attended the meeting. The students were asked to sign a contract of commitment which stated that each group
sign a contract of commitment which stated that each group member must attend a minimum of twelve of the fourteen sessions. Peer group members were told they would earn one credit for completing the course. Of the thirty-five members who attended the meeting, thirty-three agreed to be peer group members and were asked to meet for pretesting.

Selection of Control Group Members

The investigator and the English teacher, a member of the Student Faculty Selection Committee, presented a special English assignment for the thirty-eight members of the control group (Appendix I). Thirty-three students agreed to participate and were informed of the pretesting and post-testing requirements and that each test administration would be followed by a vocabulary lesson.

Description of Instruments

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale was designed by Fitts (5) to measure self-concept and is available in two forms. The clinical form was used in this study because it is more appropriate to research (2).

The clinical form of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale contains 100 items which measure different aspects of self-concept. The Total Positive Score is the single most important score (5) and is used as the measure of self-concept in this study. The scores can range from 150-450, with scores between 315 and 420 considered optimal. Individuals with
member must attend a minimum of twelve of the fourteen sessions. Peer group members were told they would earn one credit for completing the course. Of the thirty-five members who attended the meeting, thirty-three agreed to be peer group members and were asked to meet for pretesting.

**Selection of Control Group Members**

The names on an alphabetical list of students were numbered and those names with even numbers were identified as members of the control group. Of the thirty-eight students selected for membership in the control group, thirty-three students agreed to participate in the study. These students were informed of the pretesting and posttesting requirements and that each test administration would be followed by a vocabulary lesson.

**Description of Instruments**

The *Tennessee Self-Concept Scale* was designed by Fitts (5) to measure self-concept and is available in two forms. The clinical form was used in this study because it is more appropriate to research (2).

The clinical form of the *Tennessee Self-Concept Scale* contains 100 items which measure different aspects of self-concept. The Total Positive Score is the single most important score (5) and is used as the measure of self-concept in this study. The scores can range from 150-450, with scores between 315 and 420 considered optimal. Individuals with
high scores generally like themselves and have a positive self-concept, while those with low scores tend to have a negative self-concept. The Total Positive score yields an aggregate score with the following components: self-identity, self-satisfaction, behavior, physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self, family self, and social self.

The standardization group was a nationwide sample of 636 people of different ages and abilities. The test-retest reliability for this test is .92, with correlations on subscores ranging from .70 to .90 (5). Leake (5) found a discriminant validity coefficient of -.61 with the Butler Haigh Q sort. The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale also correlated with the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (5) at -.70. The content validity is reported by Wells and Maxwell to be high (5).

Possible responses on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale are: "Completely true," "Mostly true," "Partly true/partly false," "Mostly false," and "Completely false" (8). A response is determined by the degree to which the individual feels that an item describes or does not describe feelings about himself. This instrument takes forty-five to fifty-five minutes to complete.

The Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Behavior (FIRO-B) was developed by Schutz and is based on the Guttman scales (10). The FIRO-B is a fifty-four item test which assesses individual behavior toward others.
This instrument assumes that three basic interpersonal needs of inclusion, control, and affection are sufficient to account for interpersonal behavior. Each of these three needs is either "expressed" or "wanted" behavior. "Expressed" behavior is what the individual "directs" (2) toward others and "wanted" behavior is the behavior the individual wants from others but does not express. The scale furnishes six scores: Expressed Inclusion, Wanted Inclusion, Expressed Control, Wanted Control, Expressed Affection, and Wanted Affection. Each of the six subscale scores can range from zero to nine, with scores between four and six considered optimal (10). High scores indicate excessive dependency and low scores indicate excessive independence.

The instrument has a reported test-retest reliability of .70 (2). The coefficient of internal consistency is replaced by "reproducibility" as a more appropriate measure of internal consistency (10). The mean reproducibility score for all subscales is .94.

Rosenfeld studied the FIRO-B in 1971 (2) to determine whether the instrument measured three or six dimensions. He found three areas, inclusion, control, and affection, were being measured. Kramer (1) found a significant correlation between estimated and actual scores for all subscales except inclusion. Although the instrument has been normed on college students, it is suitable for administration to grades nine through sixteen as well as to adults.
The FIRO-B has been extensively used in systematic research because of its reliability and consistency (2). It is simple to administer and requires eight to fifteen minutes to complete.

The Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others--Feelings (FIRO-F) was developed by Schutz and was derived from the six Guttman scales (10). The purpose of this instrument is to assess individual feelings toward others. The terms control, inclusion, and affection in the FIRO-B are interpreted as competence, significance, and loveability in the FIRO-F (10). Each of the six subscale scores can range from zero to nine, with scores from four to six considered optimal (10). A high score indicates excessive dependency and a low score indicates excessive independence.

The FIRO-F has the same basic assumptions and methodological development as the FIRO-B. Internal consistency is noted in the reproducibility scores which range from .89 to .91 on all six scales (10). While the FIRO-F is not used as widely as the FIRO-B, scattered research indicates that the FIRO-B is almost entirely uncorrelated with background, age, sex, marital status, ethnic group, political leanings, father's education, mobility, birth order, or size of family (10). The instrument continues to be recommended for use in research because of its consistent support of the findings on the FIRO-B. The instrument is simple to
administer and requires eight to fifteen minutes to complete.

The School Interest Inventory (SII), developed by Cottle (3), purports to measure attitude toward school and to identify potential school drop-outs. The norm group was 451 students who were actual and potential drop-outs in the Michigan Public School System. The SII differentiated drop-outs from stay-in students at the .01 level of significance. The instrument contains 150 true-false items. Scores on the instrument can range from zero to ninety. The typical drop-out scale is thirty or above and the potential drop-out range is twenty to thirty. Scores of zero to nineteen are generally obtained by students who are prone to stay in school (3).

Cottle found that the test-retest reliability for eighth grade males was .78, for ninth grade males, .87, for eighth grade females at .86, and for ninth grade females at .92. Cottle reported that the reliability for all males in seventh through ninth grades is .95, and for all females is .88. The standard error of measurement is 2.5 (3). The instrument is simple to administer and requires forty to fifty minutes to complete.

Collection of Data

The following instruments were administered to the experimental and control groups and to the peer group facilitators: Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS), Fundamentals
of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Behavior (FIRO-B), Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Feelings (FIRO-F), and School Interest Inventory (SII). Tests for both peer group facilitations and peer group members were administered by the investigator in the Music Room of the alternative school which was designed for use by the peer group facilitation program. Control group members were tested in the classroom where English was taught.

The tests were administered in two parts over two days. Each test session was scheduled for only one hour to avoid participants becoming fatigued and distracted. Since the TSCS and FIRO-B took one hour to administer, they comprised the first test administration (Part I). The SII and FIRO-F also took one hour to administer and comprised the second test administration (Part II).

The twelve peer group facilitators were pretested before beginning peer group facilitation training. They were posttested fifteen weeks later at the end of the peer group program, in two test administration sessions, Part I and Part II.

Thirty-five peer group members took the pretest Parts I and II. At the end of the seven week program, twenty-eight group members took the posttest Parts I and II. Five peer group members had dropped out of school before the program was completed.
Thirty-three control group members were given the pretests, Parts I and II, by the English teacher (Appendix I). After pretesting, these students were given a vocabulary lesson on the words used in the TSCS, FIRO-B, FIRO-F, and SII as part of an English unit. After the testing and vocabulary lesson were completed, the control group members continued the work assigned to them on their individual contracts over the seven week period of the peer group program. They worked in small groups and individually and were supervised by the English teacher, a member of the Student Faculty Selection Committee. Thirty control group members were posttested because three dropped out of school before the program had been completed. Following the administrations of the posttest, Parts I and II, a vocabulary assignment was given on the words used in the TSCS, FIRO-B, FIRO-F, and SII, and the assignment was treated as part of the English unit.

Training the Peer Group Facilitators

The peer group facilitation program was implemented by the investigator and a North Texas State University faculty advisor who is a group specialist. Peer group facilitator training classes met for one hour twice a week for eight weeks, a total of sixteen sessions. Peer group facilitators were taught group leadership skills through the process of peer group interaction. Five meetings were led by the
advisor and the remaining eleven meetings were led by the
investigator, supervised by the advisor. Areas of focus
during the training were trust, self-understanding, under-
standing of others, communications skills such as listening
and responding, and group leadership skills. The Training
Syllabus for Peer Group Facilitation is included in Appen-
dix L.

The training materials were selected in part from
Samuels and Samuels' Handbook (9) because of the systematic
and highly structured format which is appropriate for a high
school peer facilitation program, and from Myrick and Erney's
Handbook (6) because of the wide variety of exercises approp-
riate to the training of peer group facilitators. These
materials also offer guidelines for initiating a peer group
facilitation program, specific recommendations for presenta-
tion of the program to the faculty, and procedures for involv-
ing faculty and staff in the program.

At the end of the peer group facilitator training pro-
gram, the twelve peer group facilitators were assigned to
six groups as co-leaders at the discretion of the University
faculty advisor and the investigator. The facilitators were
asked to contact their group members to inform them of the
date and time of the first meeting.

**Peer Group Facilitators Conducting Peer Groups**

At the beginning of the group experience, the thirty-
three peer group members were divided into six groups:
seven, six, six, five, five, and four group members. The assignment of members to groups was decided by the investigator under the supervision of the university faculty advisor. The criterion for group placement was to create a balance between males and females and personality types. The groups met twice a week in hour sessions for seven weeks. Four peer group sessions were held in the morning and two in the afternoon sessions.

The general format for each group session included the following parts: (a) a review of concerns carried over from the previous session, (b) introduction of the skill lesson for the day, (c) explanation of the homework for the next session, and (d) allotment of time for making entries in the log. The primary topics covered in the group sessions were: (a) development of understanding and awareness of self, (b) development of more effective communication skills, (c) development of problem-solving and coping skills, and (d) team building and the development of group cohesion. By the end of the seventh week, five group members had dropped out of school, leaving twenty-eight members of six groups: seven, five, four, four, four, four.

Feedback sessions were held for group facilitators after each group session to help them prepare for the next group meeting. Topics discussed during feedback sessions included how to involve all peer group members in discussion, deal with members who monopolize the discussion, deal with
feelings about abortions, and deal with peer group members you don't like. The group also used this time to share topic ideas and to explore ways of helping peer group members deal with members who had dropped from their group.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

Instruments used in the pre- and posttesting were hand-scored and these scores were submitted to the North Texas State University Computer Center for statistical analysis. Pretest scores on the four dependent variables were used in a fixed effects, one-way analysis of variance to test for initial differences between the two groups.

The hypotheses were tested using the analysis of covariance. A two group one-way analysis of covariance was used to test the significance of the differences between the two groups. The pretest scores served as the covariate, while the adjusted mean scores were the criterion measures. The .05 level of significance was used to test the hypotheses.
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents and discusses the results of the data analyses and examines each of the hypotheses tested in this study.

Pretest scores were used in a fixed effects one-way analysis of variance to test for initial differences between the two groups. There were no significant differences between the groups. Analysis of covariance fixed-effects model was utilized to test the hypotheses with the pretest scores as the covariate measures. Comparisons were made between participants and non-participants and between peer group facilitators and peer group members. The .05 level of significance was used to test the hypotheses.

It was stated in Hypothesis I that students participating in the peer group facilitation program would obtain a significantly higher adjusted mean score than non-participants on the Total Positive Score of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

The means, standard deviations, F ratios, and p values obtained for the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale for participants and non-participants are presented in Table I.
TABLE I

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F RATIOS, AND p VALUES
FOR PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS ON
THE TENNESSEE SELF-CONCEPT SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Participants Mean</th>
<th>Participants SD</th>
<th>Non-participants Mean</th>
<th>Non-participants SD</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pre</td>
<td>322.60</td>
<td>38.34</td>
<td>316.53</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Score</td>
<td>Post 319.28</td>
<td>29.72</td>
<td>322.10</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adj. 323.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>315.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F value was not significant at the .05 level and, therefore, Hypothesis I was rejected.

It was stated in Hypothesis II that students participating in the peer group facilitation program would obtain adjusted mean scores significantly different from non-participants on the six subscales of the Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others--Behavior (FIRO-B).

The means, standard deviations, F ratios and p values obtained for the FIRO-B for participants and non-participants are presented in Table II.

The F values on Expressed Control and Wanted Affection were both significant at the .04 level. However, values of the remaining four subscales did not meet the designated level of significance. Therefore, based on inconsistent evidence, Hypothesis II was rejected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Participants N=40</th>
<th>Non-participants N=30</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Affection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Affection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was stated in Hypothesis III that students participating in the peer group facilitation program would obtain adjusted mean scores significantly different from non-participants on the six subscales of the Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Feelings (FIRO-F).

The means, standard deviations, F ratios and p values obtained for the FIRO-F by participants and non-participants are presented in Table III.

**TABLE III**

**MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F RATIOS, AND p VALUES FOR PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS ON THE FUNDAMENTALS OF INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS WITH OTHERS—FEELINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Non-participants</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inclusion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pre</strong></td>
<td><strong>Post</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adj.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wanted</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inclusion</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pre</strong></td>
<td><strong>Post</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adj.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pre</strong></td>
<td><strong>Post</strong></td>
<td><strong>Adj.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>Participants (N=40)</td>
<td>Non-participants (N=30)</td>
<td>F Ratio</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressed Affection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wanted Affection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants' scores were not significantly different from those of the non-participants and, therefore, Hypothesis III was rejected.

It was stated in Hypothesis IV that participants in the peer group facilitation program would obtain a significantly lower adjusted mean score than non-participants on the School Interest Inventory (SII).

The means, standard deviations, F ratios and p values obtained are presented in Table IV.

Participants did obtain significantly lower adjusted mean scores than non-participants on the SII, and Hypothesis IV was supported.
TABLE IV
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F RATIOS, AND \( p \) VALUES FOR PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS ON THE SCHOOL INTEREST INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participants Mean</th>
<th>Participants SD</th>
<th>Non-participants Mean</th>
<th>Non-participants SD</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>28.90</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>30.03</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was stated in Hypothesis V that peer group facilitators would obtain a significantly higher adjusted mean score than peer group members on the Total Positive Score of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

The means, standard deviations, F ratio, and \( p \) value for peer group facilitators and peer group members on the Total Positive Score of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale are presented in Table V.

TABLE V
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F RATIOS AND \( p \) VALUES FOR PEER GROUP FACILITATORS AND MEMBERS ON THE TENNESSEE SELF-CONCEPT SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peer Group Facilitators Mean</th>
<th>Peer Group Facilitators SD</th>
<th>Peer Group Members Mean</th>
<th>Peer Group Members SD</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>334.00</td>
<td>34.86</td>
<td>317.71</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>332.17</td>
<td>28.94</td>
<td>313.75</td>
<td>28.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>321.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>323.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No significant difference was found in scores between these groups, and Hypothesis V was rejected.

It was stated in Hypothesis VI that peer group facilitators would obtain adjusted mean scores significantly different from peer group members on the six subscales of the *Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Behavior* (FIRO-B).

The means, standard deviations, F ratios and p values obtained on the FIRO-B for peer group facilitators and peer group members are presented in Table VI.

**TABLE VI**

**Means, Standard Deviations, F Ratios, and p Values for Peer Group Facilitators and Members on the Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Peer Group Facilitators</th>
<th>Peer Group Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>N=28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressed Inclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.58 .79</td>
<td>2.68 1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.33 1.07</td>
<td>2.36 1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wanted Inclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>.75 1.14</td>
<td>.68 1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>.17 .39</td>
<td>.32 1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>.91 .61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressed Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5.58 3.18</td>
<td>4.89 2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.42 3.20</td>
<td>5.86 2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>5.83 4.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were no statistically significant differences between the scores of the peer group facilitators and peer group members, and Hypothesis VI was rejected.

It was stated in Hypothesis VII that peer group facilitators would obtain adjusted mean scores significantly different from peer group members on the six subscales of the Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Feelings (FIRO-F).

The means, standard deviations, F ratios, and p values obtained on the FIRO-F for peer group facilitators and peer group members are presented in Table VII.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Peer Group Facilitators N=12</th>
<th>Peer Group Members N=28</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Inclusion</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Inclusion</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Control</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Control</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressed Affection</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted Affection</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were no significant differences between the scores, and Hypothesis VII was rejected.

It was stated in Hypothesis VIII that peer group facilitators would obtain a significantly lower adjusted mean score than peer group members on the School Interest Inventory (SII).

The means, standard deviations, F ratios and p values obtained on the SII for peer group facilitators and peer group members are presented in Table VIII.

**TABLE VIII**

**MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, F RATIOS, AND p VALUES FOR PEER GROUP FACILITATORS AND MEMBERS ON THE SCHOOL INTEREST INVENTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Peer Group Facilitators</th>
<th>Peer Group Members</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-12</td>
<td>N-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>28.92</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>28.92</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>28.83</td>
<td>30.54</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>29.68</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the SII, the scores of the peer group facilitators and peer group members were not significantly different from each other, and, therefore, Hypothesis VIII was rejected.

**Discussion**

The results of the present study showed that participants in the peer group facilitation program demonstrated a
significantly greater interest in school than did non-
participants. This evidence lends support to the Lackey
(5) and Johnson et al. (4) findings that an increase in
school interest followed participation in peer group
facilitation programs. It appears, as Johnson et al. (4)
have stated, that having a systematic opportunity to par-
ticipate in a school activity leads to greater interest in
school. An increase in school interest would seem to justify
the use of peer group facilitation in alternative schools.

In the current study, no difference was found between
the self-concept scores of participants and non-participants
in the peer group facilitation program (Table I). The study
also showed that self-concept scores of peer group facili-
tators did not differ significantly from those of peer group
members (Table V). These findings do not support earlier
studies (7, 3) that found self-reported differences between
the self-concept scores of participants and non-participants
in peer facilitated groups. These findings also seem to be
in disagreement with those of Dyer et al. (2) who found that
peer group facilitators felt they had made positive changes
in feelings and behaviors. However, the Dyer et al. study
(2) only published self-report data and did not provide
statistical analysis. The seeming discrepancy between the findings of this study and other related studies may be due to the fact that standardized scores were not reported in previous studies and therefore the findings are not comparable.

In the present study, there were no significant differences between participant and non-participant scores on interpersonal feelings (Table III) and interpersonal behaviors toward others (Table II). Neither were significant differences found between peer group members' and facilitators' scores on interpersonal behavior (Table VI) and interpersonal feelings toward others (Table VII). These findings seem to be in opposition to the Johnson et al. study (4) that a significant improvement in feelings toward others occurred after participating in a peer facilitated group. These findings also appear to be inconsistent with the self- and teacher-reported findings of the Frank et al. (3) and Dyer et al. studies (2) that peer group facilitators manifested more positive behavior changes than did peer group members. As has already been mentioned, unre?ported statistical findings make comparisons of the results tenuous.

In general, the literature contains self- and observer-reports of positive changes but does not provide statistical data related to measured changes in self-concept after participating in peer group facilitation programs. The lack of reported statistical findings may indicate that even though participants reported feeling better about themselves,
changes were not sufficient to bring about measurable or statistically significant differences in self-concept after a limited treatment period. Another factor to be considered is the population of the current study. Previous studies of peer group facilitation have not addressed themselves to studies of alternative school students who have already experienced failure in the school environment. The differences in populations make it difficult to compare findings.

However, it was observed that of the 101 students enrolled in the alternative school at the beginning of the peer group facilitation program, seventy per cent were involved in the study. School attendance rates for participants in peer group facilitation increased from seventy-three per cent in the third quarter to seventy-five per cent cumulative to the end of the year, and attendance rates for non-participants increased from sixty-three per cent in the third quarter to seventy-two per cent cumulative to the end of the year. Overall school attendance rates increased from fifty-seven per cent in the third quarter to sixty-five per cent cumulative to the end of the year.

It may also be noted that of the final fifteen students chosen to be peer group facilitators, all ten of the student nominees and only five of the faculty nominees were chosen. The use of sociometric devices for nomination of peer group facilitators by peers has been used in other studies (3, 5, 7), and this study tends to support the use of student
sociometric devices as adequate for selection of peer group facilitators.

The generalizability of the findings of the current study are limited by an inadequacy in the research design. There was no control for trainer effect during the training of peer group facilitation and during the control group procedures. One effort to provide some control for trainer effect, however, was the adherence to an accepted model for peer group facilitation training (6, 9).

In summary, the findings of this research support the change in school interest and do not support the changes in self-concept and interpersonal relations reported by participants and teachers in other studies. One explanation of the occurrence of a significant change in school interest and not in interpersonal relations and self-concept may be related to the fact that school interest is more specifically situational, and more likely to be affected by immediate external factors, and, thus, is more susceptible to change in a shorter period of time. The constructs of interpersonal relations and self-concept tend to be more internally consistent (6) and appear to be less easily affected by external factors such as participation in peer facilitated groups.


CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

One purpose of this study was to examine participation in and facilitation of peer groups in relation to changes in the self-concept, interpersonal relations, and school interest of adolescents attending an alternative school. A second purpose was to provide information on peer group facilitation for school counselors in an alternative school program.

Subjects participating in this study were twelve peer group facilitators, an experimental group of twenty-eight students, and a control group of thirty students, who were randomly selected from the total enrollment of an alternative school. The student population of the school was ninety-nine per cent white from predominantly middle and upper middle class socioeconomic families.

The program for training peer group facilitators consisted of sixteen one-hour training sessions, twice a week for eight weeks. The training program was conducted by the investigator and an advisor using materials especially adapted for these sessions. The program focused on developing trust, self-understanding, understanding of others, communication skills, and group leadership skills. At the
end of these training sessions, six peer facilitated groups of four to seven peer group members were co-led by the peer group facilitators, twice a week for a period of seven weeks. The investigator conducted feedback sessions for peer group facilitators after each peer-facilitated group meeting.

Measures used to assess the results of this study were the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS), the Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Behavior (FIRO-B), the Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Feelings (FIRO-F), and the School Interest Inventory (SII).

A pre-post test experimental design was employed. Pretest scores on the four dependent variables were used in a fixed effects one-way analysis of variance to test for initial differences in the groups. The hypotheses were tested using the analysis of covariance. The .05 level of significance was used to test the hypotheses. The instruments used in pre- and posttesting were hand-scored and submitted to the Data Processing Center, North Texas State University for statistical analysis.

It was predicted in Hypothesis I that students participating in the peer group facilitation program would obtain a significantly higher adjusted mean score than nonparticipants on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. The F ratio used to test this hypothesis did not reach the .05 level of significance; therefore, Hypothesis I was rejected.
It was predicted in Hypothesis II that students participating in the peer group facilitation program would obtain adjusted mean scores significantly different from non-participants on the six subscales of the Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Behavior. The F ratio computed to test this hypothesis reached the .04 level of significance on Expressed Control and Wanted Affection. However, since four subscale scores were not significant, Hypothesis II was rejected.

It was predicted in Hypothesis III that students participating in the peer group facilitation program would obtain adjusted mean scores significantly different from non-participants on the six scores of the Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Feelings. The F ratio computed to test this hypothesis did not reach the .05 level of significance; therefore, Hypothesis III was rejected.

It was predicted in Hypothesis IV that students participating in the peer group facilitation program would obtain a significantly lower adjusted mean score on the School Interest Inventory than non-participants. The F ratio computed to test this hypothesis reached the .01 level of significance; therefore, Hypothesis IV was supported.

It was predicted in Hypothesis V that peer group facilitators would achieve a significantly higher adjusted
mean score than peer group members on the **Tennessee Self-Concept Scale**. The F ratio computed to test this hypothesis did not reach the .05 level of significance; therefore, Hypothesis V was rejected.

It was predicted in Hypothesis VI that peer group facilitators would achieve adjusted mean scores significantly different from peer group members on the six subscales of the **Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Behavior**. The F ratio computed to test this hypothesis did not reach the .05 level of significance; therefore, Hypothesis VI was rejected.

It was predicted in Hypothesis VII that peer group facilitators would obtain adjusted mean scores significantly different from peer group members on the six subscales of the **Fundamentals of Interpersonal Relations with Others—Feelings**. The F ratio computed to test this hypothesis did not reach the .05 level of significance; therefore, Hypothesis VII was rejected.

It was predicted in Hypothesis VIII that peer group facilitators would obtain a significantly lower adjusted mean score than peer group members on the **School Interest Inventory**. The F ratio computed to test the hypothesis did not reach the .05 level of significance; therefore, Hypothesis VIII was rejected.
Findings

1. Students who participated in the peer group facilitation program had a greater interest in school than non-participants.

2. Students who participated in the peer group facilitation program did not experience changes in self-concept, interpersonal behavior, or interpersonal feelings significantly different from non-participants.

3. Peer group facilitators and peer group members experienced similar changes in self-concept, interpersonal behavior, interpersonal feelings, and school interest.

Conclusions

Secondary students in an alternative school can experience improved school interest. Changes in school attendance and interpersonal behaviors through participation in a peer group facilitation program appear to merit further investigation.

Recommendations

1. A peer group facilitation program should be employed at a number of alternative schools in order to explore the general validity of the procedure for this special school environment.

2. Counselors should be trained to be consultants and coordinators for peer group facilitation as part of their formal educational program.
3. Peer group facilitators should participate in an ongoing support group during the time they are peer group facilitators.

4. Students should receive training in leadership skills as part of their total educational experience.
APPENDIX A
First Luncheon Workshop

Introduction to the Peer Group Facilitation Program at a Faculty Meeting

Hello. Your principal has granted me this opportunity to introduce the Peer Group Facilitation Program to you and to answer any questions you may have.

The main purpose of this program is to provide students with the chance to help their peers by sharing mutual concerns. We know that adolescents look to their peers for acceptance and that they learn about the world in part through peer interaction. However, peer interaction can be positive or negative depending on the values of the peer leader. The Peer Group Facilitation Program trains peer group facilitators to lead peers toward more constructive behaviors and coping skills. The peer group facilitator can model effective communication, acceptance of others, and acceptance of self. However, training is needed to help the peer group facilitator lead others to more constructive and effective behaviors. Peer group facilitators are trained to identify and refer students to other resources when help is needed beyond their level of expertise.

Peer group facilitators may also be instrumental in dealing with the concerns at this school like poor school attendance, lack of school interest, and lack of school involvement because it offers the student a chance to "let off steam" with peers and to learn more effective ways of coping
with academic frustrations and poor student-teacher relationships. Thus, the Peer Group Facilitation Program may help to ease tensions in the classroom and in the school as a whole.

Teachers can assume a key role in this program by becoming active in the initial selection and final screening of peer group facilitators. Since you know these students well through your observations and interactions, your recommendations are indispensable and critical to the selection of the best choices for peer group facilitator. Your nominees for peer group facilitator would comprise one list. The students will also get a chance to make their list of nominees using a questionnaire. These two lists will form the composite list from which the final screening will take place.

The selection and screening of peer group facilitators should be done by a committee composed of representatives from the faculty and student body. A minimum of two representatives from each body may comprise the committee. The faculty member representatives may choose the student representatives for the committee. If you are interested and would like to be a member of the committee, please let me know at the end of the meeting.

The Student Faculty Selection Committee should have two functions: to screen the nominees for peer group facilitator from the composite list and to interview the potential peer
group facilitators. Approximately fifteen peer group facilitators from a total population of 100, or about fifteen percent, will be targeted for the program. This will leave a student population of between seventy and eighty-five. The lower figure, seventy, will be used in computing membership for the experimental and control groups since this figure allows a margin for the chronically absent student. Using seventy, the experimental and control groups would each have a membership of thirty-five students. This means that potentially the Program could have seven groups of five or six groups of six students minus one. These groups could be co-led by six or seven pairs of co-leaders depending on the final number of facilitators who committed themselves to the Program.

The Student Faculty Selection Committee will conduct a five-minute interview for each nominee during which time the following questions can be used as a guideline: (1) what do you hope to contribute to this Program; (2) what characteristics do you regard as most important for a helper; (3) what personal characteristic do you think might get in the way of your being helpful; (4) what aspect of the Program do you like best?

Once selection of about fifteen peer group facilitators has been made, each peer group facilitator will be trained in communication, coping, and group leadership skills. Training will take place twice a week for one hour each
during co-op classes and will incorporate feedback sessions. Topics for group leadership and concerns about leading groups will be discussed. Training will last for eight weeks or sixteen sessions and peer group facilitators will lead groups for seven weeks or fourteen sessions.

The Peer Group Facilitation Program will be offered in two parts: training of peer group facilitators and facilitation of groups. Each peer group facilitator can earn one credit for each part, thus making a total of two earned credits possible. Peer group members will be able to earn one credit for the group experience alone.

During our next meeting we will discuss peer group facilitator characteristics and I will ask for your nominations.
Peer Nomination Meeting

Hello. Now that you have had several days to think about the Peer Group Facilitation Program, do you have any further questions? Are there any faculty members who would like to volunteer for membership on the Student-Faculty Selection Committee. Good, thank you.

Today I have brought the student nomination forms for your perusal. The characteristics of peer group facilitators used in other peer group facilitation programs (1, 2) are listed on the nomination form. As you read over these, please keep them in mind as you nominate students. A copy of the student roster is available so that you may have a chance to select students who may not immediately come to mind. A minimum of two faculty votes is required for student nomination to peer group facilitator. At the end of this discussion, the nominations will be collected.

If during the week you have additional nominees, we will schedule an informal meeting of the faculty. At this time it appears that there are three students who have received strong support. Let us vote on the student representatives to the Student Faculty Selection Committee.

Now we have the representatives of the Student Faculty Selection Committee. Would a faculty representative please
inform the students selected of the decision and ask for their commitment to the Committee? Is it agreeable to you that if one of these representatives is unable to serve on this Committee that the third student be contacted to serve on this Committee? Good.

Can we arrange for the Student Faculty Selection Committee to meet next week with the faculty list and the student list of nominees to begin the selection process? Good.

Thank you for your time.
To: Teachers, Administration, and the Counselor

PEER GROUP HELPING PROGRAM

The name of the program: The Student Faculty Selection Committee had met on the previous day in response to a request from the students in Co-op classes to change the name of the program from Peer Group Facilitation to Peer Group Helping Program. The change was made in response to this request.

What is it? The Peer Group Helping Program presents an opportunity for peers to help each other. Ultimately the content of this program is designed to promote the emotional growth and individual responsibility of peer group members through the process of communication. It is hoped that students will develop more effective coping and decision-making skills, a more realistic view of self and others, more freedom to express feelings and more sensitivity to the needs of others. Peer group members can learn that their concerns and feelings are often shared with others.

Why use peer group help? Adolescents can have a positive influence on each other. That influence can effect changes in student behavior and outlook. Belonging to the group is critically important to adolescents; rejection by the group poses a serious threat to self-acceptance. Thus adolescents depend on friends for individual as well as group acceptance and are more open to give and receive help from their peer group members. Peer group leaders can offer support and
encouragement to peer group members through positive peer influence.

Is peer group help effective? Peers have been helpful to each other in the following areas: dating, sex, drugs, home conflicts, and relationships with friends. Peer help can be very effective in helping peers because peer help is an existing resource which is untapped and unrecognized. Peer help has and is being used in positive and negative ways, but it can be used to promote trust and a willingness to help others. In addition, peer group help can be used to expand the professional services to the total school population. Thus peer-led groups can free the counseling staff to cope with administrative and individual concerns that require professional expertise.

Is peer group help a substitute for professional counseling? Peer group help is not a substitute for professional counseling but can serve as a bridge to professional help when needed. Peer group helpers are trained to facilitate growth and responsibility of individuals through communication and coping skills. They are not trained to deal with the problems of personal integration, personality restructuring, or with problems of a critical nature such as suicide. Final legal and ethical responsibility rests with the professional counselor-advisor and the investigator.

Why is peer helper training necessary? Training is necessary in order that peer helpers learn to be more aware of
self and others and to facilitate better communications between peers. Part of becoming a peer group helper involves learning about group process and using this process to promote group cohesion. Basic communication responses which are taught to peer group helpers are listening, clarifying, reflecting feelings, asking open-ended questions, becoming aware of non-verbal messages, constructive confrontation, and positive feedback.

Who can learn these skills? Anyone can learn how to facilitate communication. However, choosing peer group leaders requires identification of peer group helper qualities. Qualities that have been used as guidelines in other studies (1) are listed below.

Peer Group Helper Qualities:
1. openness
2. caring for others
3. demonstrating acceptance for others
4. ability to communicate thoughts and feelings
5. sense of personal maturity and integrity
6. sense of responsibility to self and others
7. assertiveness not aggressiveness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
To: Teachers, Administrator, and the Counselor

How will these peer helpers be selected? About fifteen peer group helpers will be selected by the Student Faculty Selection Committee. Any additional nominees will be further screened by the Student Faculty Selection Committee. All nominees will be contacted by the committee members to attend a meeting in which an explanation of the Peer Group Facilitation Program and their responsibilities as peer group helpers in the program.

The Student Faculty Selection Committee will conduct interviews with all nominees during which time reasons for wanting to be trained as a peer group helper and personal goals will be explored. The final selection will be made by the Committee and these peer group helpers will be contacted by the Committee members. Parental permission will be required from all peer group helpers under eighteen years of age. Peer group helper training will begin in January and will extend for sixteen sessions, twice a week.

How will these peer group helpers be trained? Peer group helpers will be trained in one hour sessions twice a week by the advisor and the investigator. The peer group helpers will be divided into two groups: eight will be trained during the morning session and four will be trained in the afternoon session. The training sessions will teach skills that peer group helpers will need in leading groups such as:
1. how to talk with students about personal concerns and feelings
2. how to use reflective listening
3. how to help students develop problem-solving abilities
4. how to lead small group discussions
Introduction of the Peer Group Helping Program to Co-Op Classes

I am going to tell you about the Peer Group Helping Program that will be offered this spring at your school. It is a program where students learn to talk and listen better with each other. The program offers students an opportunity to learn how to be better helpers and how to lead small group discussions with fellow students.

The program has two phases: the training of peer group helpers to lead small groups and the participation of peer group members in groups led by trained helpers. The training of the peer group helpers and the participation in the peer-led groups will take place here at school and will involve two hours a week. This experience involves many different kinds of activities: talking, listening, some reading, and a few short written assignments. The training of peer group helpers will last for eight weeks and the experience leading groups will last for seven weeks. A student participating in the program may earn one credit as a peer group helper in training and one credit as a peer group helper leading groups. Peer group members may earn one credit for the seven weeks. Earning credits is contingent on regular attendance: only one absence is allowed for each phase of the program.

The first step in the program is the selection of the peer group helpers. Your faculty will have a chance to
make its recommendations for peer group helper. Now you have a chance to make your recommendations for peer group helper. I would like to explore with you the qualities you think would make a good peer group helper. Remember a peer group helper is leading small groups and is responsible for helping each peer group member talk.

Now that we have had a chance to explore these qualities, it seems that these qualities are most important: a good listener, a person who cares, a person who does not judge, a person who has "his act together." With these qualities in mind, I would like you to think about the students in your classes. Use the sheets you received to suggest the people you think have these qualities. These students will become nominees on the Peer Group Helper Nominee List and this list will be combined with the faculty list to form one list. The Student Faculty Selection Committee, represented by two students and two faculty members, will screen and interview these nominees.

All peer helpers will receive testing at the beginning of training and at the end of the experience leading groups. Peer group members and control group members will be chosen at random from a population sheet and will be tested at the beginning and the end of the group experience.

Any further questions? Yes, the peer group helper nominees will be contacted after the Committee has made its selections, probably within the week.

Thank you for your time.
APPENDIX E
Criteria for determining the peer group helpers as designed by the Student Faculty Selection Committee

Student Name ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Different Contacts a Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How many different people do you listen to in a week?
2. How often do you listen to people in a day's time?
3. If you visit on the phone, how many times do you find yourself listening to others' concerns?
4. How often do you find yourself giving advice?
5. How many people did you talk with recently about your concerns?

Criteria: minimum one time on two of the five items
Peer Group Helper Questionnaire

This questionnaire is an attempt to find out the students you would like to nominate for peer group helper. Under each question is a space to name students here at your school that you find easy to talk with and that you think would make good leaders. If you would like the Committee to consider you as a peer group helper, please write your name in number six.

1. Who would you talk with about a problem getting along with coworkers at your job? or with your boss?

_________________________  __________________________

2. Who would you ask to help you with a boyfriend or girlfriend problem?

_________________________  __________________________

3. Who would you speak with about a problem in your family?

_________________________  __________________________

4. Who would you talk with about a sexual or pregnancy problem?

_________________________  __________________________

5. Who would you talk with about a drug or alcohol problem, either your own or someone else's?

_________________________  __________________________

6. If you would like to be considered for being a peer group helper please write your name in the space here and mark morning or afternoon co-op sessions.  __________________

morning  __________________ afternoon  ________________
Lesson 1: Topic—Developing Trust

Complete two of the three following assignments:

1. Write your reactions to what happened in the first group meeting. Be sure to include:
   a. What you valued the most and how you felt about it (what did you like best or find helpful?)
   b. What you wanted to change and why.

2. Working with a person in this course, write a short description of that person and include what you like most about him/her. (Think back to our training session.) Then write down two ways you are like that person. Approximately 25 words.

3. Read pages 1-14 in Why Am I Afraid to Tell You Who I Am by J. Powell. On page 9, 
   
   "... and I am different" is part of a reaction to a difficult experience. Recall and write down one experience which made you different and how you felt about it. (Approximately 50 words.)

Lesson 2: Topic—Getting to Know Others

1. Choose a person at school that you don't know well and would like to know better, and
learn as much as you can about that student.
Tell what happened. What did you learn about
that person? How did you feel about that
experience and how would you change it if you
were to do it again? (Keep it short.)
Guidelines for Diary Writing

In your diary, please include the following topics:

I. Either A or B
   A. Write something you learned about yourself or
   B. Something you already noticed and it felt good to share it

II. Write something you learned about communication or working with people

III. Was there any part of today's session you felt was not helpful? What was it? What would you change?

IV. Write your reaction to one other member in the group

V. Write the date for each entry: for example, 2/1/79
Presentation of the Peer Group Facilitation Program to Control Group Members

The investigator and the English teacher agreed on the manner in which the English assignment would be presented to the control group members. The English teacher called each control group member to her desk and explained that this English assignment was composed of two parts: two vocabulary assignments and two testing sessions. She further explained that extra credit could be earned by completing both parts of the assignment.

The English teacher explained that the two testing sessions would take place in one week and at the end of May, and that each session would be followed by a vocabulary lesson, consisting of about ten words taken from the test materials. The English teacher stressed that both parts had to be completed in order to earn credit and gain verbal commitment from each control group member.
APPENDIX J
Contract for Group Leadership Course

Please read carefully. If all the items presented fit with your schedule and needs, please sign the space at the bottom. Group leaders will receive one credit for 8 weeks of training in leadership and small group dynamics skills. The training requirements will consist of:

GROUP TRAINING

1. Attendance: at a minimum of 15 of the 16 meetings which occur twice a week for one hour each and which last for 8 weeks. (Group will probably meet on Tuesday and Thursday at 9:00 and 12:30 during CO-OP.)

2. Completion of 8 of the 10 study lessons, or one for each week. All lessons are due at the end of 8 weeks. Lessons one and two are included as samples of the kind of activities that will be required. However, ideas for activities and assignments related to the topics are welcome and will be incorporated into the lessons as much as possible. Also, assignments that are repetitious or meaningless will be eliminated and/or edited.

3. To get credit, all parts of each study lesson must be completed.

GROUP LEADERSHIP (During the next trimester)

1. To sign up, you must be in attendance for the
trimester beginning March 3 in order to co-lead the groups you have been trained to lead. This experience will last for 8 weeks, twice a week for a total of 16 meetings. In addition, there will be one hour per week of group supervision which will replace all written assignments except the keeping of the daily account or log of your group.

2. Parental permission is required to take this course.

________________________  ________________________
Your signature                    Counselor/Supervisor
January 15, 1979

Dear

The Valley View Learning Center is developing a program for students in individual and group leadership skills. Particular areas stressed will be communications, decision-making and coping with concerns. This program is composed of two parts: a course in training leaders for group leadership and a follow-up course in leading groups. A faculty-students committee has chosen ________________ to be a group leader in our school. Each student group leader will assist in leading group discussions in their classes.

We are recommending that all student leaders take a brief training course during school hours to teach them leadership skills. They will receive course credit for this experience.

If you have any questions feel free to contact Brice Jackson, Coordinator, Valley View Learning Center at 243-7399.

-------------------

PERMISSION TO TAKE GROUP LEADERSHIP PROGRAM DURING THE SCHOOL DAY

I would like my son/daughter ________________ to participate in the group leadership program.

Parent Signature ________________ Relationship ______

Date ______

Brice Jackson
Coordinator
Valley View Learning Center
243-7399
Session 1

Objective: Getting Acquainted  

Part I: Introductions

Step 1: The trainer shared perceptions about self and others.

Step 2: The trainer gave feedback to the peer group facilitators and checked for accuracy of perceptions.

Part 2: Loosening-up Exercises  

The trainer instructed each peer group facilitator to turn to the person next to him and introduce each other. They were instructed to learn about what school and non-school activities that person liked, and to be prepared to introduce their partner to the group.

Step 1: Getting to Know You  

The trainer instructed the peer group facilitators to take partners to a private corner and to take five minutes each to share personal information that they would like to share with the group.

Step 2: Letting the Group Know You  

The trainer asked that the peer group facilitators return to the circle and that each partner introduce the other in turn. The trainer instructed them to share not only information but also feelings and impressions that each had of their partners.
Step 3: Sharing  5 minutes

The trainer instructed the peer group facilitators to share with the group how it felt to really look and listen to the partner. While doing this activity, one person spoke at a time while the others were instructed to observe that person.

Step 4: Checking  10 minutes

The trainer checked the listening skills of the peer group facilitators by asking other members of the group to repeat the introduction. The person who was being introduced was asked to verify the information given.

Part 3: Writing in the Log  10 minutes

Criteria for writing in the log was given: the nature of the information and the length of each entry. The trainer explained that writing in the log was a part of the training program and that ten minutes would be given at the end of each meeting for this writing.

Session 2: Defining the Helping Relationship
Objective 1: Attending Skills  10 minutes
Part 1: Introducing Attending Skills

The trainer shared some perceptions of the interactions which occurred during the first session and asked for responses from peer group facilitators. The trainer noted those in the group who were giving eye contact, leaning forward, and facing the speaker. The trainer explained that these were signs of attending behavior. The trainer continued
speaking and then asked the peer group facilitators which persons they felt were listening and what gave them that impression. The trainer encouraged discussion and used this discussion to bring out aspects of attending behavior. The trainer gave positive feedback to those attending and responding.

Part 2: Demonstration of Attending Behavior Use

Role Playing 20 minutes

A peer group facilitator was picked by the trainer to role play attending behavior with the trainer. The trainer then shared a situation in which feelings of anger and frustration were present. The peer group facilitator was encouraged to repeat the content to the trainer. The peer group facilitator and trainer then returned to the larger group.

Step 1: 5 minutes

By way of review, the trainer asked the peer group facilitators what attending behaviors they saw in this interaction. The trainer re-emphasized the importance of these behaviors by asking for reactions to people who were attending.

Step 2: 15 minutes

The peer group facilitators were asked to pair off and role play reflecting content. The trainer instructed them to be aware of attending behaviors.
Step 3: 5 minutes

After both partners had a chance to role play, the peer group facilitators returned to the large circle and were asked to share impressions and perceptions.

Objective 2: Defining the Helping Relationship

Part 1: Discussion of Helping Characteristics 10 minutes

The trainer asked the group members to share what characteristics they thought most helped people communicate. After brainstorming with the group, the trainer placed the following questions on the board:

1. Is it possible for a person not to need others?
2. Is it really possible for one person to help another?
3. What song or quote best illustrates what helping means to you?
4. What are some problems of being a helping person? (2)

These questions were discussed and the peer group facilitators were encouraged to share their thoughts and feelings with others.

Part 2: Writing in the Log 10 minutes

The following questions were given as guidelines to be used in the log writing for the day:

1. What did you learn about yourself today?
2. What did you learn about someone else in the
that you did not know before today?

3. What do you consider to be the characteristic that you have to offer which would be most helpful to a peer group member and why?

Session 3: Reflecting Content

Objective: Active and Passive Listening 15 minutes

Part 1: Introducing Active and Passive Listening

The trainer spoke about active and passive listening and defined passive listening as communication using um-um's along with other non-verbal reactions. Active listening was defined as reflecting the content of the message back to the person sharing a concern.

Step 1: Getting Feedback

The trainer asked each peer group facilitator in the circle to reflect the content of what had been said.

Step 2: Checking the Feedback

As each peer group facilitator reflected the content, the trainer asked other peer group members to verify the content. Thus the trainer used the content of the message as a vehicle for teaching the process of reflecting the content in active discussion.

Part 2: Role-playing Reflecting Content 10 minutes

A peer group facilitator and the trainer interacted in a role-playing situation in order to illustrate reflecting content. After the trainer had reflected what the peer group
facilitator said, the trainer asked for a response to the reflection. Then the roles were reversed. The peer group facilitator was encouraged to ask for feedback from the other peer group facilitators as to the accuracy of the response.

Part 3: Role-playing in Dyads 15 minutes

The peer group facilitators divided into dyads and role-played the reflection of content. After each interaction, the trainer encouraged them to check out the accuracy of their feedback. The trainer then brought them into the larger circle and asked for general feedback on this exercise.

Part 4: Assignment

The assignment was to reflect content with someone outside this session, either at home or in school. The trainer stressed checking for accuracy of their feedback.

Part 5: Writing the Log 10 minutes

The following questions were used as guidelines for the log entries:

1. What new skill have you learned and who are you going to practice it with?

2. Describe the feelings that you had when you finished the role-playing exercise.

3. How do you think reflecting content will help you be a more effective helper?
Session 4: Communications Skills

Objective: Reflecting Feeling

Part 1: Introducing Reflecting Feeling 45 minutes

The trainer asked one peer group facilitator to summarize the last session on reflection of content. Then experiences that peer group facilitators had when doing the homework assignments were shared. The trainer summarized these responses and reflected the content to the peer group facilitator. It was revealed that a problem had occurred when she had attempted to reflect the content of an interchange with an alcoholic parent. The trainer reflected the peer group facilitator's feelings about the situation. Then the trainer used this example to draw a distinction between reflection of content and reflection of feeling. The peer group facilitators were asked to note the non-verbal clues such as expression in the eyes, tremor in the voice. The accuracy of feelings was checked and encouragement was used to help the peer group facilitator to work through this experience.

Part 2: Writing in the Log 10 minutes

The trainer instructed the peer group facilitators to write their responses to the following questions in their logs:

1. Have your feelings toward any peer group facilitators changed today?

2. What do you think made the difference?
3. What would you like to tell this peer group facilitator that you did not have a chance to say?

Session 5: Communication Skills

Objective: Reflection of Feelings 15 minutes

Part 1: Using the material from Myrick (1), the trainer asked for the names of feelings and these were placed on the board. The trainer explained that feelings have different qualities, pleasant and unpleasant, and placed these on the board in their appropriate categories. The peer group facilitators discovered that all feelings are not easy to categorize. They were also amazed at the number of feelings named.

Part 2: Role-playing Nonverbal Feelings 5 minutes

The topic of how to recognize what a person is feeling without the use of words was explored. The discussion explored non-verbal cues such as eyes, facial expressions, posture, tone of voice, etc. The trainer asked two peer group facilitators to summarize and reflect the content of this discussion. Then a volunteer was asked to select a feeling and to act out that feeling. The other peer group facilitators were to suggest what that feeling might be and to check their guess for accuracy with the peer group facilitator. Several peer group facilitators took turns acting out a feeling non-verbally (3).

Part 3: Practicing Reflecting Feelings 20 minutes

The trainer and a peer group facilitator role-played
acting out a feeling non-verbally and checking out perceptions with the person acting this out. The roles were reversed. After each role-play, the peer group facilitators were asked for their perceptions of the feelings presented. Then the peer group facilitators were asked to work in dyads. The trainer observed the dyads working and made comments to help and encourage the students.

Part 4: Writing in the Log

10 minutes

The following questions were presented to be used as guidelines for writing in the log:

1. What did you learn today about reflecting feelings?
2. Which do you think is more difficult, reflecting content or reflecting feelings and why?
3. Who will you practice this skill with?
4. What have you learned about yourself today?

Session 6: Communication Skills

Objective: Perceptions are the Observer’s Reality

Part 1: Film—Eye of the Beholder (6) 40 minutes

After the film, the trainer asked the peer group facilitators what impressed them most about the film. The discussion led to the conclusion that there is no absolute reality and that each reality depends on the person perceiving the reality.

Part 2: Reading Assignment

5 minutes

Copies of I Am Loveable and Capable (IALAC) (4) were given to the peer group facilitators to read. The trainer
asked everyone to keep the following question in mind:
Whose reality is most important in the story? Why?

Part 3: Writing in the Log 10 minutes
1. What did you learn about perceptions today?
2. What would you like to change about your relationships with others? What would you like to keep?
3. What would you like to change about yourself? What would you like to maintain?

Session 7: Communication Skills
Objective: Teaching Feedback

Part 1: Perceptions Are Subjective 10 minutes

The trainer asked a peer group facilitator to summarize the story, *I Am Loveable and Capable*, and its connection to the topic of perceptions. The importance of individual perceptions was discussed.

Part 2: What Is Feedback? 20 minutes

Feedback was defined as the reflection of your perceptions about the feeling and content another expresses. The trainer used the Myrick Communications Feedback Model (1) to teach the feedback skill:

1. Be specific
2. Say how it makes you feel
3. Express what you want to do

Step 1: Role-playing Giving Feedback

The trainer and a peer group facilitator used role-play
to convey the idea of giving feedback. The trainer then asked the larger group to reflect the content and feeling expressed. The responses were checked for accuracy. The trainer then asked the peer group facilitator for his reaction. During this time the feedback model was utilized and discussed by the group as a whole.

Step 2: Practicing Giving Feedback

The trainer encouraged the peer group facilitators to work in dyads practicing giving feedback. The trainer observed the dyads working and gave encouragement and suggestions when needed. After five minutes the partners were asked to reverse roles. Stress was placed on being specific, knowing how it makes you feel, and what you want to do.

Part 3: Writing in the Log

The trainer gave the following questions for response in the log:

1. What are the steps of the feedback model?
2. Which part did you find the easiest and the hardest to do?
3. How was feedback helpful to you?

Session 8: Communication Skills

Objective: Feedback Continued

Part 1: How Perceptions Impact Feedback

A discussion began on the nature of feedback. A peer group facilitator raised a question as to the importance of
sharing your own perception. The trainer stressed that unless you start with your own perception it is difficult to know what someone else may be perceiving. The example of the boy in IALAC was used to illustrate this point. The trainer further explained that giving feedback is a way of helping the other person get in touch with his own perceptions.

Part 2: The Triad

10 minutes

The trainer introduced a new model, the triad. In this model, there are three persons, the two who are interacting who will be called A and B and the observer. The trainer asked for two peer group facilitators to help model this new process. After persons A and B had role-played reflecting content and feeling and used the Feedback Model, the trainer modelled the role of the observer. All the other peer group facilitators were asked to play the observer.

Part 3: Practicing the Triad Model (3) 20 minutes

The peer group facilitators were asked to divide into threes and to practice the triad model. After person A had role-played once, the positions were to be rotated so that each person would have a chance at each of the positions. The trainer supervised each triad.

Part 4: Writing in the Log

Questions to be used as guidelines follow:

1. What feedback did you think was particularly
effective in your group and what was the situation?

2. How might you have changed your feedback to make it more effective.

Session 9: Communication Skills: Open-ended Questions
Objective: Clarifying the Difference Between Open-ended Questions

Part 1: Role-playing Open and Closed Questions

The trainer asked a peer group facilitator to review and summarize the feedback session. The peer group facilitators wanted to practice working in triads again. When one group had a difficult conflict to resolve, this group asked to present their situation to the group as a whole. The peer group facilitators were asked to give their feedback.

In this process, a question about the difference between open and closed statements was asked. The situation was role-played using closed questions and then using open questions. The trainer asked the peer group facilitators what differences they saw in these interactions.

Part 2: Practicing Open-ended Questions 30 minutes

The trainer asked the peer group facilitators to use the triad model to practice open-ended questions. As the groups role-played a situation of conflict, the trainer supervised the interaction and helped the observers in each group. After each person had had a turn at all three positions, the groups were instructed to choose what they considered their best open-ended questions and present these to the group as a whole. After each situation was presented
and feedback was given, the entire group was encouraged to give feedback. The group agreed that open-ended questions were most effective.

Part 3: Writing in the Log 10 minutes

1. Give two reasons why open-ended questions are more effective than closed questions.
2. Which do you find more difficult and why?
3. What have you learned today?

Session 10: Overview of Communications Skills

Objective: Review Communication Skills Learned Thus Far

Part: Summary 10 minutes

The skills learned so far were placed on the board. The trainer asked if there were any comments in the logs which needed to be discussed because they had not been so far. After a short discussion, the trainer introduced Youth Helping Youth (3), a film on peer group facilitation.

Part 2: Showing the Film, Youth Helping Youth (3) 10 minutes

The peer group facilitators were asked to make notes about areas of the film that needed clarification. Discussion of these areas was encouraged and served to review reflection of feeling, content, the feedback model, and open-ended questions.

Part 3: Writing in the Log 10 minutes

Questions to be used as guidelines in writing the log are as follows:
1. What did you learn today about peer group facilitation?
2. What did you learn about yourself?
3. What kinds of questions are asked in the log—open or closed questions? How do you know?

Session 11: Learning Group Dynamics
Objective: Understanding How a Group Works
Part 1: The Importance of Structure 20 minutes

The trainer asks what has made this group work and encourages discussion of this topic. Responses were placed on the board: trusting others, caring about others, listening and reflecting others' communications, and asking questions to get more information. The trainer asked about the role of open-ended questions. A short review of open and closed questions was given.

During this discussion one peer group facilitator remained silent and seemed preoccupied. The trainer used this situation to illustrate the effect of a silent or withdrawn member on the group by asking what would make this group discussion more cohesive. Several peer group facilitators indicated that they had noticed the silent member and were wondering what they could do about this situation. The trainer encouraged the peer group facilitators to draw this member out. When using open-ended questions failed to do this, the trainer suggested that they think of another approach. The peer group facilitators tried reflecting
feelings using non-verbal cues. In this way the peer group facilitators were able to draw out the silent member and to experience success in doing so. They also learned which methods seem to work best for that person.

The trainer stopped this interaction and asked a peer group facilitator to summarize what had happened. After this process was clarified, the trainer suggested that the peer group facilitators break into triads and that one person role-play the silent member.

Part 2: Role-Play Helping the Silent Member 20 minutes

The peer group facilitators divided into triads and role-played the silent members, each person taking a turn. The trainer gave feedback and supervision of each triad. At the end of this exercise the trainer called the peer group facilitators into the larger circle and asked the peer group facilitators to share an experience they thought worked out well. After this situation was role-played for the larger circle, the effectiveness of using feedback and open-ended questions was re-emphasized.

Part 3: Writing in the Log 10 minutes

The following questions were used as guidelines for log writing:

1. What is the value of open-ended questions for group interaction?

2. What is the value of feedback for the persons role-playing?
3. What did you learn today about group structure?

Session 12: Rules for Group Interaction

Objective: Understanding Group Dynamics

Part 1: Structuring Interactions 10 minutes

The trainer reviewed the content of the previous discussion and encouraged further exploration on group dynamics. When several people began to talk at once, the trainer used this situation to illustrate the importance of establishing the rule that one person speaks at a time while the others listen. The trainer used the Myrick movie (3) to help the peer group facilitators review the rules for group discussion and these were placed on the board.

Part 2: Exploring a Topic 30 minutes

One peer group facilitator questioned how to keep the group going. The trainer asked for three volunteers to role-play a situation that was printed on a card. These situations were passed out to all the peer group facilitators.

Situation 1: My boyfriend left me a note saying we were broken up.

Situation 2: My mother blamed me for the dirty floor when it was my brother's fault as usual.

Situation 3: Mat asked me to go to the party after Joyce refused him.

After these volunteers role-played the first situation, the trainer encouraged the other peer group facilitators to
give feedback to the group. The other peer group facilitators divided into triads and role-played these situations. Each time feedback was encouraged. After these were shared, the peer group facilitators were asked which questions and feedback statements helped the most. From this discussion, some questions emerged which became guidelines for exploring a topic:

1. What happened?
2. What did the person say?
3. How was the person feeling?
4. What did the person want to do?
5. What did the person finally do?
6. How did that person feel about the outcome?

Part 3: Writing in the Log 10 minutes

The following questions were used as guidelines for writing in the log:

1. What did you learn about open-ended questions today?
2. Which of the six questions we discussed is the hardest for you to remember?
3. What did you learn about yourself today?

Session 13: Communications—Questions and Statements

Objective: When to Use Questions and When to Use Reflective Statements

Part 1: Clarifying the Use of Questions and Statements

A peer group facilitator stated that he had attempted to use questions and reflective statements at home and had
become very confused. The trainer asked the peer group facilitators to help this person, and several members shared their ideas. A role-play situation was used to help determine the best approach to the conflict situation in which the peer group facilitator who had the question played the person presenting the problem. During this role-play, other aspects of the conflict became clear and the situation was clarified. Peer group facilitators concluded that both techniques could be used in turn to facilitate interaction.

Part 2: Giving Advice 20 minutes

During this role-play situation, several peer group facilitators attempted to give advice. The trainer asked for a volunteer to role-play this part of the conflict again. Then other peer group facilitators were encouraged to practice open-ended statements. The volunteer was asked to give feedback to the first and second responses. The trainer helped them to label their first responses as advice giving and the second as reflecting feelings. These reactions were written on the board so that all the peer group facilitators could study them.

Part 3: Writing in the Log 10 minutes

The following questions were used as guidelines to the log writing:

1. What effect did advice giving have on the interaction?
2. What have you learned about yourself today?

3. What feedback would you like to give today that you have not done as yet?

Session 14: Communication—Giving Advice/Exploring Alternatives

Objective: Understanding the Effects of Advice-Giving on Group Dynamics

Part 1: Review Giving Advice 20 minutes

The trainer asked the peer group facilitators to share their responses to No. 1 in their log book. After several peer group facilitators responded, a review and discussion of advice giving and its effect on group interaction occurred. The trainer asked for volunteers to role-play a situation using open-ended questions and closed questions. After the role-playing, feedback was given by the peer group facilitators.

Part 2: Exploring Alternatives 20 minutes

Using the situation presented in review of giving advice, the trainer illustrated how alternatives could be explored using open-ended questions and reflection of content and feeling. The trainer used the demonstration to show that open-ended questions were the key to further exploration of alternatives.

Part 3: Writing in the Log 10 minutes

Questions used for guidelines in the writing of the log:
1. What is the difference between exploring alternatives and giving advice?
2. How can you tell that you are giving advice rather than helping someone to explore alternatives?
3. What did you learn about someone in the group today?

Session 15: Starting the Group Interaction
Objective: Teaching Opening Responses

Part 1: Using Topics 20 minutes

A major concern of the peer group facilitators was how to get the group started. The trainer asked how groups had been started here, and two ways were discussed: bringing up a topic and using the non-verbal cues of peer group members. The group wanted topics to draw on and brainstorming for topics followed. These topics were placed on the board and were entered in the logs:

1. What makes me angry is
2. What I like most about school is
3. What I want to do in five years is
4. What I would like to change about school is
5. The person I dislike most is and why
6. The person I like the most is and why
7. I really feel good about myself when I can
8. I feel most sad when
9. I am most like my mother in
10. I am most like my father in
Part 2: Running the Group

The trainer asked for three volunteers to practice running the group of peer group facilitators. The trainer explained that each peer group facilitator would get ten minutes and that they could choose any of the topics on the board. After each peer group facilitator ran the group, a feedback session was given during which the peer group facilitators indicated what was effective and what was not effective.

Only one peer group facilitator had the experience of leading the group on this day because the session became confrontative. As a result, the trainer took the opportunity to explain appropriate confrontation. The trainer pointed out that confrontation is giving feedback which is discrepant from the way in which someone perceives the situation. The trainer pointed out that constructive confrontation describes the discrepancy in behavior and is not a personal attack.

Part 3: Writing in the Log

The following questions were used as guidelines for log writing:

1. In confrontation what is the effect of criticizing the person rather than the behavior of the person?
2. How did you feel about today's session?

Session 16: Communication--Confrontation

Objective: How to Use Confrontation
Part 1: Practicing Leading Groups

The peer group facilitators each had a turn to lead the larger group. During these practice groups, the trainer helped the peer group facilitators deal with confrontation. When put-downs were given, the trainer helped the peer group facilitator deal constructively with these statements. Each peer group facilitator had five minutes to lead the group and receive feedback.

Part 2: Writing in the Log

10 minutes

The following questions were used as guidelines in the log writing:

1. What did you like best about the group interactions?
2. What was most helpful to you? Least helpful to you?
3. How do you feel about leading groups now?

PEER GROUP FACILITATORS LEAD GROUPS

Each group was led by two peer group facilitators and supervised by the trainer. Topic cards from Values Clarification (5) were provided for students who felt a need to use them as aids for group discussion. A twenty minute feedback session was given after each morning and afternoon session for all peer group facilitators. During this time, group experiences were shared, conflicts and problems aired, and more effective ways of leading groups were explored.
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